

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4 – 33 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1, 2, 4 – 7, 9 – 23, and 25 – 32 have been amended, and Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 AND §103

Claims 1 – 3, 11 – 17, 19, and 27 – 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinschnitz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,253,184). Claims 4 – 10, 18, and 20 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinschnitz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,253,184). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, it is first respectfully submitted that the invention as presently claimed calls for a knowledge base of reusable solutions for a type of unit (e.g., a type of aircraft) which is stored in a computer-based medium. A customer with a maintenance problem for which a solution is not readily accessible or known can thus access this knowledge base for assistance in diagnosing and fixing the problem. In this manner, customers can access generic service information regarding a certain type of unit and avoid re-generating known solutions due to lack of communication between a

customer who previously generated a solution for the problem and a customer who currently has the same problem, but is unaware of the previously developed solution. Additionally, since the knowledge base is available via a computer-based medium which is not required to be attached to the unit itself, access to the knowledge base is not subject to the availability of the unit. Independent claim 1 recites “providing a knowledge base of reusable solutions...; storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium [which is] accessible to a plurality of users; receiving an incoming message from at least one specific user of the plurality of users, where the incoming message characterizes a technical issue...; and sending [an] outgoing message to... the at least one specific user from the computer-based medium.” Independent claims 19, 27, and 32 recite similar features.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest such an arrangement. Kleinschnitz discloses a method for failure evaluation of a system in a machine-driven environment that is fixed to the unit (i.e., aircraft) for which it is intended, and therefore tracks the history of that specific unit only. See Kleinschnitz, Col. 1, line 66 – Col. 2, line 6; and Col. 2, lines 17 – 32. Further, the service information created by such a machine-driven diagnostic system is not available to more than one user at a time. Rather, it is available only to a single user that must connect directly to the specific unit, because the failure evaluation data is stored within the memory of the specific unit itself. See Kleinschnitz, Col. 2, lines 17 – 24. A user connecting to the memory of the unit will thus only have access to a time history of maintenance information regarding the specific unit (e.g., a single aircraft) to which they are connected. Such an arrangement is directed to a different problem than that addressed

by the present invention. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Kleinschnitz neither teaches nor suggests the invention as presently claimed in independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 32. Claims 2, 4 – 18, 20 – 26, 28 – 31, and 33 depend from independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 32, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons cited above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Minor additional amendments have also been made throughout the pending claims to reference a “mobile platform,” rather than an aircraft.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 15, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/sdo